

Appl. No. 10/639,072
Amdt. dated May 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 05, 2005

REMARKS

By the above amendments, applicant has canceled claims 2-8 and 10-18 without prejudice.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,408,388). Applicant traverses the rejection as follows:

Kobayashi et al is stated to disclose a planar illuminating device including a light source, a light guide plate having an incident surface for receiving light from the light source, a bottom surface, and a light emitting surface for emitting the light, wherein the light emitting surface has a contour in a shape of a plurality of prisms disposed continuously thereon.

Amended claim 1 now recites in pertinent part "wherein the light emitting surface has an mxn array of continuous uniform pyramid-shaped prisms disposed on the light emitting surface."

Applicant now traverses the rejection insofar as it applies to amended claim 1 as follows:

As stated in the Detailed Action on page 6 of the second Office action (OA), Kobayashi et al. does not specifically teach or suggest the prisms being in the shape of a pyramid. That is, Kobayashi et al. clearly fails to teach the present invention as set forth in claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is

Appl. No. 10/639,072

Amdt. dated May 26, 2005

Reply to Office Action of Apr. 05, 2005

submitted to be novel over Kobayashi et al.

Claims 2, 4-5 and 7-8 have been canceled, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Claims 9-10, 12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,408,388).

Amended claim 9 now recites in pertinent part "wherein the light emitting surface has an m×n array of continuous uniform pyramid-shaped prisms disposed on the light emitting surface."

Applicant now traverses the rejection insofar as it applies to amended claim 9 as follows:

As stated in the Detailed Action on page 7 of the second Office action (OA), Kobayashi et al. do not specifically teach the prisms being in the shape of a pyramid. That is, the structure of amended claim 9 is different from that of Kobayashi et al. Accordingly, amended claim 9 is submitted to be novel over Kobayashi et al.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 are respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 12, and 14-15 have been canceled, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Appl. No. 10/639,072

Amdt. dated May 26, 2005

Reply to Office Action of Apr. 05, 2005

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,408,388). Applicant has now canceled claims 16-18, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 3, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,408,388) in view of Teragaki et al. (U.S. Patent 6,123,431).

Claim 3 has now been canceled, and the subject matter thereof has been incorporated into amended claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 3 is traversed on the basis of a rejection of amended claim 1. Applicant asserts that there is nothing in Kobayashi that teaches or suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that he or she might or should provide pyramid-shaped prisms of amended claim 1.

Though Teragaki et al. teaches a light guide plate incorporating prisms in the shape of pyramids, neither Kobayashi nor Teagaki contains any suggestion (express or implied) that they be combined, or that they be combined in the manner suggested. In fact, in Kobayashi the transmitting plate (2) intentionally use the evenly arranged elongated structure with the trianbular cross section thereof between the two side light sources (3) for completely guiding the light. On the other hand, in Teragaki all embodiments require an uneven arrangement for the brightness vs. distance consideration, disregarding whether it is the pyramid type or the elongated type prismatic structure. To combine the even/uniform arrangement of Kobayashi to the uneven arrangement of Teragaki essentially teaches away from what is pursued in each individual reference. **It is NOT an**

Appl. No. 10/639,072
Amdt. dated May 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 05, 2005

obvious combination.

Furthermore, the backlight system as recited in amended claim 1 produces new and **unexpected results**. That is, the backlight system having pyramid-shaped prisms distributed uniformly and continuously can enhance the brightness of the outgoing light beams, simplify the manufacturing process, and reduce costs. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable over Kobayashi et al. in view of Teragaki et al. under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Applicant has canceled claim 6, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,408,388) in view of Teragaki et al. (U.S. Patent 6,123,431).

Claim 11 has now been canceled, and the subject matter thereof has been incorporated into claim 9. For reasons similar to those asserted above in relation to claim 1, amended claim 9 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable over Kobayashi et al. in view of Teragaki et al. under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 are respectfully requested.

Applicant has canceled claim 13, and the rejection relating thereto is now

Appl. No. 10/639,072
Amdt. dated May 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Apr. 05, 2005
moot.

In fact, clearly the invention is essentially adapted to be applied to $M \times N$ array wherein M and N are integrals being not less than 2. Applicant is willing to put this limitation to the claims for strengthening the features thereof and not covering the $M \times 1$ array, if the Examiner can agree with the aforementioned non-obviousness arguments.

In view of the foregoing, the present application as claimed in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Tai-Cheng Yu et al.

By 
Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137